

9/Reg for
Reconsider
2-25-00
C/m



PATENT
B208-062 DIV

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants : Shigeo Yamagata, et al.
Serial No. : 08/926,882
Filed : September 10, 1997
For : VIDEO SIGNAL RECORDING APPARATUS
Examiner : T. Tran
Art Unit : 2712

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR §1.121(a)

This is in response to the Office Action of August 16, 1999.

The Examiner has rejected applicants' claims 32-38 and 45-48 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-2 of U.S. Patent No. 5,719,984 taken in view of the Shimada, et al. patent. The Examiner has further rejected applicants' claims 32-37 and 45-48 under 35 USC §102(b) as anticipated by the Shimada, et al. patent. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants' independent claim 32 recites a reproducing apparatus including a display mode setting means. This means controls the amount of reproduced data signals to be displayed and has first and second modes involving respective different display amounts. A data signal converting and supplying means

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, D.C. 20231, on: February 16, 2000

February 16, 2000
Date of Signature

JOHN J. TORRENTE
Signature

2/25/00
JL

converts the reproduced data signals into character signals for supply to a monitor and under control of the display mode setting means supplies the character signals to the monitor in respective different amounts. Such a construction is not taught or suggested by claims 1 and 2 of the '984 patent taken with the Shimada, et al. patent or by the Shimada, et al. patent taken alone.

More particularly, there is nothing stated in claims 1 and 2 of the '984 patent which mentions control of the supply of character signals reproduced from a plurality of data signals so that they are supplied in different amounts to a monitor. Moreover, it is not believed that the Shimada, et al. patent discloses this feature.

In particular, the Shimada, et al. patent teaches recording data signals in first and second audio areas of a recording medium. The Shimada, et al. patent further teaches the use of different recorded ID signals (11, 01, 10) to determine whether character signals are in the two audio areas (11), in one of the audio areas (01) or in neither audio area (10). Finally, the Shimada, et al. patent teaches reproducing the recorded data signals to retrieve the character signals for display.

However, the Shimada, et al. patent does not teach or suggest different modes of operation in which a plurality of data signals corresponding to characters are reproduced to

retrieve the characters and the characters are displayed in different amounts associated with the different modes. Thus, claims 1 and 2 of the '984 patent taken with the teachings of the Shimada, et al. patent or the teachings of the Shimada, et al. patent taken alone fail to teach or suggest the invention of applicants' independent claim 32 and its dependent claims.

Applicants' independent claim 47 recites a reproducing apparatus for reproducing recorded image data and recorded ID data from a recording medium. A judging means judges whether the ID recorded data is effective or null and the control of the display of the ID data is based on this judgement.

Again, claims 1 and 2 of the '984 patent do not teach judging whether recorded ID data is effective or null and then controlling the display thereof based on the judgement. Additionally, the Shimada, et al. patent fails to teach or suggest making a judgement as to ID data being effective or a null and controlling the display based on this judgement.

Independent claim 47, and its dependent claims, thus patentably distinguish over claims 1 and 2 of the '984 patent taken with the Shimada, et al. patent and over the Shimada, et al. patent taken alone.

Finally, applicants' independent claim 45 recites a reproducing apparatus in which a display means displays reproduced image information, first identification information

and/or second identification information and the display means is controlled to change the display position of a character image depending upon whether the first identification signal is reproduced alone or with the second identification information.

Again, this construction is not taught or suggested by the cited art.


In particular, while claims 1 and 2 of the '984 patent recite such display control, the control is effected during recording not reproducing. Moreover, the Shimada, et al. patent, while dealing with reproducing, does not teach or suggest control of the position of the display of character information based on whether first identification or first and second identification is reproduced. Nor does the Shimada, et al. patent suggest doing so in the system of claims 1 and 2 of the '984 patent.

Independent claim 45, and its dependent claims, thus patentably distinguish over claims 1 and 2 of the '984 patent taken with the Shimada, et al. patent and over the Shimada, et al. patent taken alone.

In view of the above, it is submitted that applicants' claims, as amended, patentably distinguish over the cited art of

record. Accordingly, reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


John J. Torrente
Reg. No. 26,359
Filed Under \$1.34(a)

ROBIN, BLECKER & DALEY
330 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10017
(212) 682-9640
February 16, 2000